

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

| |
|---|
| California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115. |
|---|

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

In re J.Z. et al., Persons
Coming Under the Juvenile
Court Law.

B300537
(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. Nos.
19CCJP03708A
19CCJP03708B
19CCJP03708C)

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF
CHILDREN AND FAMILY
SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

A.G.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from orders of the Superior Court of Los Angeles
County. Rudolph A. Diaz, Judge. Affirmed.

Marsha F. Levine, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel, Kristine P. Miles, Assistant County Counsel, and Aileen Wong, Senior Deputy County Counsel, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In this juvenile dependency appeal, appellant A.G. (mother) challenges the juvenile court's jurisdictional findings declaring her three minor children dependents of the court. In particular, mother argues the evidence does not support a finding either that she abused drugs or that her drug use placed the children at substantial risk of serious harm. As discussed below, we conclude substantial evidence supports the juvenile court's exercise of its jurisdiction and, therefore, we affirm.

BACKGROUND

1. The Family and Previous Dependency Referrals

This appeal involves mother and her three minor children—13-year-old twin daughters, J.A.Z. (J.A.) and J.M.Z. (J.M.), and 11-year-old son, J.Z. (son). J.M. has alopecia, for which she is under a doctor's care and takes prescribed medication. The children's father, O.Z. (father), is not a party to this appeal.¹ Mother and father have a history of domestic violence, one episode of which resulted in mother's arrest in 2014. After her arrest, mother's relationship with father ended. Since then, the children have lived with mother and periodically visit father. Mother also has an adult son from a different relationship. Her adult son is not involved in these proceedings.

¹ Because father is not a party to this appeal, we include facts related to him only when relevant.

Between 2011 and 2015, the Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services (Department) received six referrals regarding the family. The Department closed each referral as inconclusive, unfounded, or “evaluated out.”

2. Events Preceding Petition

In early May 2019, the Department received a referral alleging general neglect of the children by mother. The referral claimed mother recently was seen smoking a drug called “wax” (a form of marijuana) and son was seen with a black eye. The Department opened an investigation.

A Department social worker visited the twins’ school to speak with them. The social worker was unable to speak with J.A. because although she was at school that day, she had been skipping her classes, as was her habit. The social worker spoke with J.M. J.M. told the social worker she and her siblings usually walked to school in the morning on their own because mother left for work before they were awake. She said mother usually was home in the afternoon after school. J.M. denied seeing mother use drugs or alcohol and said mother did not physically discipline the children. She told the social worker son’s eye was bruised because he was hit with a soccer ball while playing soccer. A couple of weeks later, however, J.M. recanted that story and admitted she injured son’s eye when she threw a shoe at him during an argument. She explained she was initially dishonest about the incident because she was nervous.

The social worker also spoke with two employees at the twins’ school. One told the social worker the twins each had an Individual Education Plan (IEP). The employee had no abuse or neglect concerns for the twins and noted mother was “very nice”

and “did not appear to be under the influence of substances during interactions.” The other employee told the social worker she recently had seen mother briefly on campus and noticed mother’s arms had what the employee described as “ ‘bumps’ ” “like when someone is doing drugs.”

The Department social worker also visited son’s school. Although son was absent, a school employee told the social worker she had no concerns about son’s safety or well-being. Approximately one week later, the social worker learned son had been absent for almost two weeks and the school had been unable to reach mother because her phone was disconnected. When son returned to school, the school nurse met with him. According to the nurse, son told her he had been sick and in bed but had not seen a doctor. The nurse did not see any marks or bruises and reported son appeared healthy.

The social worker also spoke with the apartment manager of the building where mother and the children lived. The manager told the social worker she had “ ‘concerns for the whole family.’ ” According to the manager, the children did not go to school, mother “ ‘rent[ed] to the homeless by day and it’s a dirty home that smells like cigarettes and marijuana.’ ” The manager stated that when she conducted an inspection of mother’s apartment one month earlier, she could not walk through the second floor of the apartment. The manager said once a person smoking on an outside staircase told her “they were trying to rent a room” in mother’s apartment and mother recently “had a big fight” with another tenant. The manager also stated the children were “ ‘weird,’ ” but she had never seen any marks or bruises on them.

On May 28, 2019, after many unsuccessful attempts and weeks after the Department's investigation began, two Department social workers interviewed mother and the children at their home. The social workers noticed "several red sores" on mother's forearms but did not believe mother was under the influence of any substances at the time.

One of the social workers interviewed mother privately. Mother explained son's black eye was caused by a shoe J.M. had thrown during an argument. Mother noted J.M. told her she had lied when interviewed at school about son's eye because she was embarrassed. Mother said she did not take son to a doctor because she feared she would be accused of injuring son and her children would be taken from her. Mother told the social worker she begins work at 6:00 in the morning and is usually home by 3:00 in the afternoon. She said the children are home alone in the morning and walk to school on their own. Mother preferred her morning work schedule because it allowed her to be home with the children in the afternoon and evening. Mother stated the twins each had an IEP because they "are slow," but mother was unable to explain their developmental delays. Mother denied she had mental health problems but stated she "often feels very stressed," especially recently as a result of problems with her neighbors and the apartment manager as well as J.A.'s poor behavior. Mother noted when she was younger she "took a bottle of sleeping pills because she thought it would be better if she were not around."

The social worker asked mother about her alleged substance abuse. Initially, mother denied any substance use. Eventually, mother admitted she smoked "wax" one time approximately one week earlier but she did not like it. She also

said she smoked marijuana one to two times a week to ease her stress. Mother then stated she tried “Crystal” (i.e., methamphetamine) for the first time “‘a couple days ago’ ” but she did not like it either. Eventually mother admitted she used “‘Crystal on an ongoing basis’ ” before her older son was born but she had stopped using it and no longer had a problem with it. The social worker asked mother about the sores on her arms as well as visible tooth decay, which the social worker believed indicated ongoing methamphetamine use. Mother insisted “she only used one time” and explained when she is stressed she picks at her skin. Finally, mother acknowledged she needed and wanted help. She agreed to enroll in an outpatient substance abuse program, make mental health appointments for herself and the children, make dental appointments for the children, and drug test for the Department. When mother indicated she did not have or could not locate her identification, the social worker said the Department could provide her with identification for testing the next day.

A social worker also interviewed son at home. The social worker saw no bruising on son. Son indicated he was happy at home and at school. He explained his eye was injured when J.M. threw a shoe at him when they were arguing over a video game. He denied any physical abuse or discipline. He said no adults other than mother slept at their home and no renters stayed with them. Son denied anyone drinking, smoking, or otherwise using drugs in the home.

During her interview, J.A. explained J.M. threw a shoe at son, injuring his eye. J.A. said mother kept son home from school after his eye injury because “‘it looked bad.’ ” J.A. denied drug use in the home or adults other than mother sleeping there. J.A.

stated she “hate[d] school” but was trying to improve her grades. The social worker saw no marks or bruises on J.A.

The social workers conducted a home inspection of mother’s apartment. They observed an adequately furnished apartment with working utilities and sufficient food. Although the home had three bedrooms, one was not used and was almost empty. Mother explained that bedroom had been her older son’s bedroom, but he had moved out approximately five months earlier after someone he brought home committed suicide in the room. Mother stated the person, who her son did not know well, shot himself in the head when her son left the room to clean a plate. Mother and the three minor children were home at the time and, since then, no one felt comfortable in that room. Before concluding their visit, one of the social workers reminded mother of the “temporary verbal safety plan,” which included drug testing the following day. Mother said she understood.

The following day, mother appeared for her drug test but “she could not pee” despite drinking three bottles of water and trying three times to leave a sample over the course of almost two hours. The day after her inability to test, mother told a Department social worker she had “peed” before she went to the drug testing site. She said, “ ‘I don’t know why I did that, I don’t know.’ ” She also explained that when she used “ ‘meth last week,’ ” the children were with a neighbor and mother had gone to a friend’s house “ ‘to smoke weed.’ ” Unbeknownst to mother, her friend “ ‘put Crystal in the Weed.’ ” Mother said she did not like the experience and would not do it again. Mother also admitted she had not made any of the appointments she said she would make for herself and the children. A few days later, however, mother reported she had made a therapy appointment

for herself, and the children were on a waiting list for therapy sessions.

When speaking with another Department social worker a couple of weeks later, mother stated her stomach had been upset on the day she was to test, which was why she used the rest room before going to the testing site. She also said when she smoked marijuana, she did so when the children were asleep.

Although father was difficult to contact, a Department social worker eventually spoke with him. Father expressed surprise that mother might be abusing drugs. He stated, “ ‘[S]he told me she has been clean.’ ”

In early June 2019, at the Department’s request, the juvenile court authorized the removal of the children from mother. On June 10, 2019, a Department social worker met mother at her home and explained the children would be “taken into protective custody in order to allow . . . mother the ability to get the help she needs to address the substance abuse.” Mother began crying but remained calm. The children were placed in foster care that day.

3. Petition and Detention

On June 12, 2019, the Department filed a one-count petition under Welfare and Institutions Code section 300 on the children’s behalf (petition).² The one count was brought under subdivision (b)(1) of section 300 and alleged mother abused drugs, rendering her incapable of caring for the children and placing them at risk of serious harm, and father failed to protect the children. Specifically, the petition alleged: “The children[’s] . . . mother . . . has a history of substance abuse including

² Undesignated statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

methamphetamine abuse and is a current abuser of marijuana, wax and methamphetamine, which renders the mother incapable of providing the children with regular care and supervision. The children's father . . . knew or reasonably should have known of the mother's substance abuse and failed to take action to protect the children. The mother's substance abuse endangers the children's physical health and safety and places the children at risk of serious physical harm, damage, and danger."

At the detention hearing held the following day, the juvenile court ordered the children detained from mother and father and placed in shelter care under Department supervision. Soon after, the children were placed with their paternal aunt and paternal grandmother, where they remained for the duration of the proceedings below. The court ordered monitored visits for mother and father as well as weekly on-demand drug testing, parenting counseling, and individual counseling.

4. Adjudication and Disposition

a. *Continued Investigation*

Prior to adjudication, the Department continued its investigation and conducted further interviews.

In a June 20, 2019 court filing, the Department reported that in order to attend court-ordered programs, mother had changed her work schedule to the afternoon-evening shift (2:30 p.m.–11:00 p.m.). Mother stated she had enrolled in a substance abuse program with parenting and individual classes. The Department noted mother "clearly loves her children," "is proactive and motivated to participate in services in order to address the case issues," and had "expressed her willingness to cooperate." However, the Department also noted "mother's current lack of child care and consistent history of neglectful [*sic*]

pertaining to the children's school attendance/participation, which includes special education," "significant concerns as to . . . mother's mental health status and substance abuse," as well as the fact mother had not yet submitted a successful drug test. The Department believed mother was "withholding/or in denial of the seriousness and severity of her involvement with illegal drugs and stability of her mental health."

On June 24, 2019, the juvenile court ordered drug testing for mother and father. Two testing dates were scheduled for mother in June. Mother failed to appear for either.

In mid-July 2019, a Department social worker spoke with mother, the children, and paternal aunt. Mother told the social worker, "I started doing weed when I was a teenager. I stopped when I got pregnant with my oldest [son]. Then I started using again this year. For two months, I used wax.'" She said she liked wax and smoked it with a pipe, saying, "It felt very relaxed and lazy.'" As for methamphetamine, mother stated, "I was at my friend's house and they gave me a joint laced with crystal. That was the worse [*sic*]. It was the one time I did crystal. I didn't do it any other times.'" Mother also said she used crystal for a month before her older son was born and she did not like it then either. The social worker asked mother about her tooth decay and "pock marks" on her face and arms, which the social worker noted were consistent with methamphetamine use. Mother answered, "That's not from crystal. I am very anxious and I pick at myself."

Mother continued to miss her scheduled drug tests, missing two in early July. Mother told the social worker she missed her first drug test because she could not urinate, then she missed her next test because she did not have proper identification. Mother

reiterated she had enrolled in a substance abuse rehabilitation program but, by late-July, the social worker had not yet confirmed mother's enrollment in the program.

The social worker also spoke with the children. J.A. and son both denied drug use in the home. (It does not appear that the social worker asked J.M. about drug use.) Son told the social worker mother " 'usually sleeps when I am at school. She usually sits down [to] watch TV. Her face is sad and I try to cheer her up. She doesn't talk about the things that make her sad.' "

Although paternal aunt did not spend a lot of time with mother, she believed mother was " 'a good mother.' " Paternal aunt told the social worker she was surprised when the children were removed from mother because of drug use. Paternal aunt did not know if mother used drugs. She said when she visited mother and the children, mother's " 'home was clean and the children were well taken care of.' "

Also in mid-July 2019, the family participated in a multidisciplinary assessment team (MAT) meeting. According to the report from the MAT meeting, each of the children displayed physically and verbally aggressive behavior toward each other and each had an IEP for school. It was also reported that because of low grades and poor attendance, J.A. did not complete eighth grade but would enroll to begin ninth grade in the fall. In addition, the children all reported witnessing domestic violence between mother and father in the past, as well as seeing their parents intoxicated in the past. Although the children could not remember exactly when their parents were intoxicated or what substance or substances they were using at the time, the children reported their parents were under the influence of drugs. The children were eager to return to therapy.

In its jurisdiction and disposition report for the court, the Department urged the juvenile court to sustain the petition. The Department believed mother both minimized the seriousness of her drug use and tried to hide her drug use by not testing. The Department also pointed to mother's tooth decay and marks on her face and arms, which the Department believed to be physical signs of mother's methamphetamine use. In addition, the Department believed the children tried to protect mother by denying she used drugs but admitted in the MAT meeting they had seen mother under the influence. Finally, the Department noted mother's inability to "manage her children's increasingly problematic behavior."

Prior to adjudication, the Department filed two last minute reports for the court. In late-July 2019, a Department social worker reported father said he was unaware of mother's drug use and the children had never mentioned it to him. However, father also stated after learning of mother's alleged drug use, he questioned the children about it. He said, "They were iffy about telling me. I got the sense they knew what was going on.'" "They just told me that they suspected that she was using. They saw several bongs. They didn't say that they specifically saw her get high. They told me that they saw a couple of things that were not right.'" Father said he confronted mother about the allegations and mother told him "she was occasionally using and it was when the kids were asleep.'" But more recently mother had told father she was "staying 100% sober.'" When asked about the marks on mother's face and arms and her tooth decay, father stated she had some marks when they were together, but the marks were not as bad then. He said mother had "a tendency to pick at herself [when] she gets nervous,'" but he did

not know if the marks were from drug use. He had seen mother recently and she “ ‘looked sober.’ ”

In late-August 2019, the Department reported mother had three scheduled drug tests in August, she appeared for all three, and all results were negative.

b. *Hearing*

The adjudication and disposition hearing was held on September 4, 2019. Mother, father, and Maria Messick, a Department social worker familiar with the case, testified at the hearing.

During her testimony, mother agreed she had a history of substance abuse, including methamphetamine and marijuana wax. She also agreed her substance abuse had, “from time to time, limited [her] ability to provide care and supervision for [her] children.” Mother stated she had not used methamphetamine since before her older son was born, which was more than 20 years earlier. Mother testified she missed several scheduled drug tests because she did not have the required identification, but she had since obtained proper identification and was testing negative.

During his testimony, father denied the children told him they saw several bongs in the home or that he ever spoke to the children about mother using drugs. Father testified he did not know whether mother used drugs. He also testified as to his past drug use, indicated he no longer used drugs, and stated his current work schedule made it very difficult if not impossible for him to appear for drug tests.

During her testimony, Messick stated the Department believed the juvenile court should sustain the petition, declare the children dependents of the court, remove them from their

parents, and order family reunification services for both mother and father. Messick acknowledged the Department's position was based in large part on the fact the parents consistently had missed drug tests. She also found the sores on mother's face significant. Messick testified that when she met with mother she did not suspect mother was under the influence, no one had mentioned seeing mother under the influence of drugs or suspecting mother was under the influence, and mother had been willing to work with her. Messick also testified father had told her the children were "iffy" about discussing mother's drug use, but they had told him they "saw several bongs" and he felt they knew what was going on. Messick also stated father told her mother had said she was using drugs only occasionally and only when the children were asleep.

Following testimony, the juvenile court heard argument from counsel. Counsel for the Department urged the court to sustain the petition. Counsel highlighted mother's admission of past drug use, her "candid" acknowledgement that her drug use limited her ability to provide regular care and supervision for the children, and her many missed drug tests.

Counsel for the children argued the Department had failed to show a connection between mother's drug use and any current risk of harm to the children. Counsel stated, "I simply can't find enough information in the record, either in documentary evidence or in testimony, to indicate that my clients have been harmed by the parents' historical drug use and historical domestic violence." Mother's counsel and father's counsel both joined in the children's counsel's argument. Counsel for mother argued, "Looking at the totality of the situation, the Department has provided a lot of suspicion, and suspicion is not proof. They have also provided a

lot of speculation, but speculation is not risk.” Counsel believed the evidence showed “recent [drug] use, but certainly not current abuse and certainly not anything that would place the children at risk necessitating [Department] involvement or court supervision.”

The juvenile court amended the petition by striking the reference to father and his alleged failure to protect the children. The juvenile court sustained the petition as amended, finding the children were persons described by section 300. In making its decision, the court stated, “I do find that mother’s refusal or failure to test is an indication, and this is because of mother’s recent admitted drug usage. I think the event where the child was injured, was not taken to school to avoid [Department] involvement, is another reasonable interpretation that mother was avoiding [the Department], not just for an indication of possible child abuse, but also because mother was using.” The court also relied on the apartment manager’s statement that mother’s home was dirty and smelled of marijuana. As to mother, the court concluded, “I do think that mother demonstrates testimony about her complexion and pockmarks and admitted drug usage, I think is sufficient, and there is a nexus regarding the children not going to school, a dirty home on that one occasion when the interview took place. It is also one of the children testified about mother sleeping during the day, sleeping late and being sad, which all indicates substance abuse. So I am sustaining the petition as pled against mother. I am finding that the allegations are proved by a preponderance of the evidence.”

The juvenile court ordered the children removed from mother and released to father. Mother was granted monitored

visits with the children and ordered to participate in a full drug and alcohol program with aftercare, weekly drug testing, parenting classes, and individual counseling.

5. Appeal

Mother appealed from the juvenile court's September 4, 2019 orders.

DISCUSSION

1. Standard of Review

We review the juvenile court's jurisdictional findings for substantial evidence. (*In re Jonathan B.* (2015) 235 Cal.App.4th 115, 119.) We will affirm if there is reasonable, credible evidence of solid value to support the court's findings. (*Ibid.*)

“ ‘In making this determination, we draw all reasonable inferences from the evidence to support the findings and orders of the dependency court; we review the record in the light most favorable to the court's determinations; and we note that issues of fact and credibility are the province of the trial court.’ ” (*In re I.J.* (2013) 56 Cal.4th 766, 773.) Under this standard, our review “ ‘begins and ends with a determination as to whether or not there is any substantial evidence, whether or not contradicted, which will support the conclusion of the trier of fact. All conflicts must be resolved in favor of the respondent and all legitimate inferences indulged in to uphold the verdict, if possible. Where there is more than one inference which can reasonably be deduced from the facts, the appellate court is without power to substitute its deductions for those of the trier of fact.’ ” (*In re David H.* (2008) 165 Cal.App.4th 1626, 1633.) “We do not reweigh the evidence, evaluate the credibility of witnesses, or resolve evidentiary conflicts. [Citation.] The judgment will be upheld if it is supported by substantial evidence, even though

substantial evidence to the contrary also exists and the trial court might have reached a different result had it believed other evidence.” (*In re Dakota H.* (2005) 132 Cal.App.4th 212, 228.)

However, “ ‘substantial evidence is not synonymous with *any* evidence. [Citations.] A decision supported by a mere scintilla of evidence need not be affirmed on appeal. [Citation.] Furthermore, “[w]hile substantial evidence may consist of inferences, such inferences must be ‘a product of logic and reason’ and ‘must rest on the evidence’ [citation]; *inferences that are the result of mere speculation or conjecture cannot support a finding* [citations].” [Citation.] “The ultimate test is whether it is reasonable for a trier of fact to make the ruling in question in light of the *whole record*.” ’ ” (*In re David M.* (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 822, 828.) “[T]he evidence supporting the jurisdictional finding must be considered ‘ “in the light of the whole record” ’ ‘to determine whether it discloses substantial evidence—that is, evidence which is reasonable, credible, and of solid value.’ ” (*In re I.C.* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 869, 892.)

2. Applicable Law

The juvenile court exercised its jurisdiction under section 300, subdivision (b)(1). Under that subdivision, a juvenile court may assert dependency jurisdiction and declare a child a dependent of the court when “[t]he child has suffered, or there is a substantial risk that the child will suffer, serious physical harm or illness, as a result of the failure or inability of his or her parent or guardian to adequately supervise or protect the child, . . . or by the inability of the parent or guardian to provide regular care for the child due to the parent’s or guardian’s . . . substance abuse.” (§ 300, subd. (b)(1).)

“The legislatively declared purpose of these provisions ‘is to provide maximum safety and protection for children who are currently being physically, sexually, or emotionally abused, being neglected, or being exploited, and to ensure the safety, protection, and physical and emotional well-being of children *who are at risk of that harm.*’ (§ 300.2, italics added.) ‘The court need not wait until a child is seriously abused or injured to assume jurisdiction and take the steps necessary to protect the child.’” (*In re I.J.*, *supra*, 56 Cal.4th at p. 773.) “‘The purpose of dependency proceedings is to prevent risk, not ignore it.’” (*Jonathan L. v. Superior Court* (2008) 165 Cal.App.4th 1074, 1104.) “The provision of a home environment free from the negative effects of substance abuse is a necessary condition for the safety, protection and physical and emotional well-being of the child.” (§ 300.2.)

“Although evidence of past conduct may be probative of current conditions, the court must determine ‘whether circumstances *at the time of the hearing* subject the minor to the defined risk of harm.’ [Citations.] Evidence of past conduct, without more, is insufficient to support a jurisdictional finding under section 300. There must be some reason beyond mere speculation to believe the alleged conduct will recur.” (*In re James R.* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 129, 135–136.) A parent’s failure to take responsibility for, or to recognize the negative effects of, his or her conduct is relevant to the court’s consideration of risk under section 300. “[D]enial is a factor often relevant to determining whether persons are likely to modify their behavior in the future without court supervision.” (*In re A.F.* (2016) 3 Cal.App.5th 283, 293.) “One cannot correct a problem one fails to acknowledge.” (*In re Gabriel K.* (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 188, 197.)

3. Substantial evidence supports jurisdiction.

Mother argues substantial evidence does not support the juvenile court's jurisdictional findings. In particular, mother claims the evidence does not support findings either that she currently abused (as opposed to used) drugs or that her drug use placed the children at substantial risk of serious harm. As discussed below, we disagree.

Initially, we conclude substantial evidence supports a finding that mother abused drugs, including marijuana and methamphetamine. Mother minimized her drug use, claiming for example she used drugs only when the children were asleep or when she was not with them, and she did not like certain drugs and would not use them again. However, during the Department's investigation, mother was inconsistent and less than forthright about her past and present drug use. For example, after initially stating she did not use any drugs, mother admitted she smoked "wax" once a week before, then later still said she had been smoking "wax" for two months. During the course of these proceedings, mother admitted she needed help and at the adjudication hearing testified her drug use sometimes affected her ability to care for the children. Before testing negative three times, mother had missed all of her previous five drug tests. In addition, while the children were reluctant to report mother used drugs, they conceded during their MAT interviews they had seen mother intoxicated and admitted to father they had seen drug paraphernalia at home. Finally, although mother said the marks on her arms and face were caused by anxiety-induced self-picking, she did not explain her apparent tooth decay. *In re L.C.* (2019) 38 Cal.App.5th 646,

relied on by mother, is factually distinct and does not change our analysis.

Having concluded substantial evidence supports a finding of drug abuse, we consider whether mother's drug abuse placed the children at substantial risk of serious harm. Mother argues there is no nexus between her drug use and any risk of harm to her children. She points out a parent's substance abuse alone is insufficient to warrant dependency jurisdiction. (*In re Rebecca C.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 720, 728.) She notes the children had never been physically harmed as a result of her drug use. Mother claims it is, therefore, impossible to predict beyond mere speculation future harm.

Mother's position ignores or dismisses other facts in the record. Most significantly, it is undisputed all three children displayed physically aggressive behavior toward one another. In fact, J.M. so injured son's eye during an argument mother kept son home from school for almost two weeks. In addition, the children told father they saw drug paraphernalia in the home, and it was undisputed the children were unattended for periods of time each day during the week. Finally, although mother admitted she needed help and acknowledged that "from time to time" her substance use had "limited [her] ability to provide care and supervision for [her] children," she appeared to be in denial as to the severity of her drug use. (See *In re A.F.*, *supra*, 3 Cal.App.5th at p. 293.) Thus, in light of the entire record, we conclude this is not a case where jurisdiction was premised solely on a parent's substance abuse. As mentioned above, "[t]he purpose of dependency proceedings is to prevent risk, not ignore it." (*Jonathan L. v. Superior Court*, *supra*, 165 Cal.App.4th at

p. 1104.) We conclude substantial evidence supports the juvenile court's exercise of its jurisdiction.

Mother does not challenge the juvenile court's dispositional orders independent from the court's jurisdictional findings. Thus, because we affirm the juvenile court's exercise of its jurisdiction, we affirm the court's dispositional orders as well.

DISPOSITION

The September 4, 2019 orders are affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

LUI, P. J.

We concur:

ASHMANN-GERST, J.

HOFFSTADT, J.